

1959

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

731

gates realize that whatever free time they do have can be profitably and entertainingly spent seeing the wonders of one of the world's great cities. And, incidentally, New York, the world's financial and commercial center, offers opportunities for delegates to make personally profitable their attendance at the national conventions by taking care of any business they have in New York City.

More than 750 convention groups a year attest to the fact that a New York City convention is a successful convention.

It is my sincere hope, speaking as a New Yorker, that my city will be honored by being chosen as the site of the 1960 Republican and Democratic National Conventions. Senator KEATING and I bespeak, I feel certain, the wishes of the some 20 million Americans who live in the city's metropolitan area, an area which includes also part of Connecticut and New Jersey. New York City is in the midst of the Nation's population heartland; it is a world capital; it is the cultural and communications center of the Nation; it is the biggest city; it will welcome the national conventions in 1960.

NOMINATION OF ROGER W. JONES AS CHAIRMAN OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, this morning the President submitted to the Senate for confirmation the nomination of Roger W. Jones to be a member of the Civil Service Commission. Following the confirmation of his nomination, Mr. Jones will become Chairman of the Commission.

Mr. Jones is excellently qualified for this position, and his nomination should meet with the unanimous approval of all. He is a career public servant, having first entered the Federal service in 1933.

Not only does he know the problems of the civil service employee, but his many years of contacts with the executive and legislative branches of the Government will make for better relations between the different branches of the Government and the Government employee.

It is with genuine pleasure that I urge confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Jones. I suggest that the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service call a meeting of the committee at the earliest opportunity for the consideration of this nomination.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a biographical sketch of Roger W. Jones be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the biographical sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROGER W. JONES

Roger W. Jones took office as Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget on September 11, 1958. Prior to his appointment to this post by the President, he had been one of the Bureau's three statutory assistant directors for 6 months.

A career civil servant, Mr. Jones was Assistant Director for Legislative Reference from February 1949 to March 1958. He entered the Federal service in 1933, and served in a series

of posts with the Central Statistical Board before joining the staff of the Bureau in 1939. When the United States entered World War II, Mr. Jones was Administrative Officer of the Bureau.

He was ordered to active duty as a captain in the Officers Reserve Corps in March 1942, assigned to duty with the Combined Chiefs of Staff, Munitions Assignments Board. He was promoted to major in May of that year, to lieutenant colonel in March 1943, and to colonel in May 1945. He was released to inactive duty in December 1945, and served in several capacities in the Bureau of the Budget until 1949.

He was born in New Hartford, Conn., on February 3, 1908. He received a bachelor of arts degree from Cornell University in 1928, and a master of arts degree from Columbia University in 1931.

He has been awarded the Legion of Merit, the Order of the British Empire, the National Civil Service League's Career Service Award, and the President's Award for Distinguished Federal Civilian Service.

He is married and has three children, a daughter, Mrs. John Hodges of Cumberland, Md.; and two sons, Roger H. Jones, a graduate student at Cornell University; and Airman Edward C. Jones, USAF.

STATEMENTS BY SECRETARY OF STATE BEFORE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations has had a most discouraging experience recently in trying to obtain information from the Secretary of State on which to ground our thinking about foreign policy issues facing this country.

It is customary for the Secretary to appear before the committee at the beginning of each session of the Congress and review the problem areas for which he is responsible. These statements have sometimes been so generalized as to be of little help to the committee. Our distinguished chairman made an effort this year to sharpen the discussion a little. He wrote to the President and asked for a series of briefings on the state of U.S. relations with the rest of the world, the state of our military defenses, and the state of our economic relations. The chairman attached to his letter an outline of the subjects, some 13 of them, which he hoped would be touched upon during these briefings. The President replied that he would be glad to have Secretary Dulles coordinate such presentations in executive sessions of the committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this exchange of correspondence be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
December 16, 1958.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In past years it has been customary for the Secretary of State to appear in executive session before the Committee on Foreign Relations early in each new session of Congress to give members the benefit of his views with respect to the state of our international relations. The committee has found the Secretary's testimony of great value in the discharge of its responsibilities in the field of foreign relations.

In order for the committee to have a full picture of our relations with the rest of the world, it seems to me that the Secretary's statement should be supplemented by testimony concerning the state of our military defenses and the state of our economic relations with the rest of the world. Furthermore, it is important, I believe, that the committee acquire an intelligent evaluation of our world posture as it is related to that of the Soviet bloc. The coordinated national estimate which such testimony would provide seems to me to be essential to enable the committee intelligently to consider foreign policy issues that will come before the Senate this year.

Would it be possible this year to arrange for appropriate officers of the executive branch to brief the committee along the general lines of the enclosed outline?

I am sure members of the committee would be most grateful for the assistance of the Executive, thus making it possible to begin deliberations this session on a broad foundation of mutual understanding.

Most respectfully.

Sincerely yours,

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Chairman.

PROPOSED OUTLINE FOR EXECUTIVE SESSION HEARINGS OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

GENERAL PURPOSE

To provide the Committee on Foreign Relations with a broad understanding of the total strategic situation of the United States in 1959 so that the committee may properly discharge its duties in the field of foreign policy.

HEARING I. THE STATUS OF U.S. RELATIONS WITH OTHER COUNTRIES

1. Relations with the Soviet bloc and estimates of the tactics and pressures which may be encountered in 1959.
2. Relations with uncommitted Asian and African nations.
3. The status of our alliances.
4. Probable areas of change in U.S. policies in 1959.

HEARING II. THE DEFENSE POSITION OF THE UNITED STATES

1. Potential defensive responsibilities of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.
2. Estimate of the state of readiness of each service to discharge its responsibilities today and in the future.

HEARING III. ECONOMICS AND FOREIGN POLICY

1. The domestic impact of U.S. aid programs.
2. Relationship between trade policy and foreign policy.
3. Soviet bloc activities in trade and aid.
4. Probable areas of U.S. initiative in 1959.

HEARING IV. INTELLIGENCE ESTIMATES

1. Estimate of Soviet bloc intentions.
2. Estimate of Soviet bloc capabilities—military, economic, political, and scientific.
3. Estimate of nature and direction of nationalist movements in Asia and Africa.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 22, 1958.
The Honorable THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: Thank you for your December 16 letter. I appreciate your committee's interest in meeting with the Secretary of State and with the other executive branch officials who can discuss with you in executive session the matters outlined in your letter to me. Accordingly, I have asked Secretary Dulles to coordinate this matter, so that the officials concerned may meet with your committee at a mutually satisfactory time.

With best wishes for the holiday season,
Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Senators will note that Chairman GREEN suggested that the Secretary of State deal in his briefing with the following four subjects:

1. Relations with the Soviet bloc and estimates of the tactics and pressures which may be encountered in 1959.
2. Relations with "uncommitted" Asian and African nations.
3. The status of our alliances.
4. Probable areas of change in U.S. policies in 1959.

Secretary Dulles appeared before the Committee on January 14. The meeting was in executive session. As usual, it was understood that nothing which the Secretary might say would be published without his having an opportunity to suggest deletions for security reasons. Members of the committee awaited with more than usual interest due to the advance preparation for the meeting which I have referred to—to what the Secretary might say.

The principal remarks of the Secretary of State were contained in a lengthy prepared statement which he diligently read. I have gone through these remarks with a pencil and underlined those sentences in which there was contained some new information or some revealing insight or some provocative idea or some analytical assistance. I found six sentences. Only six sentences in the whole statement could, by any stretch of definition, be considered new or provocative. The rest was a rehash of old press releases and old speeches.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the Secretary's statement before the committee with the six sentences which I have referred to in italic.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE JOHN FOSTER DULLES, SECRETARY OF STATE, BEFORE THE SÉNATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 14, 1959

I. INTRODUCTION

The world is today changing more rapidly than ever before. But the fact that much is changing does not mean that everything has changed. There are certain values, certain principles, that are enduring. Among these are the concepts of individual human dignity and the supremacy of moral law.

In a changing world our task is to strive resolutely that change shall increasingly reflect the basic principles to which our Nation has, from its origin, been dedicated.

II. OUR BASIC PURPOSES

1. At a time when war involves unacceptable risks for all humanity, we work to build a stable world order.

2. We seek for general acceptance of the concept of individual dignity which will lead to the spread of responsible freedom and personal liberty.

3. We seek that the free nations shall attain a more rapid rate of economic growth, so that their independence will be more secure and vigorous and so that there will be greater opportunities for cultural and spiritual development.

III. THE PRIMARY THREAT

The Soviet Union and Communist China are expanding their economic and industrial power at a very rapid pace. They do so by a system which combines governmental rule of all labor with imposed austerity. This

makes it possible greatly to accelerate capital developments.

There is emphasis, too, on quality. A spectacular product of Soviet material accomplishment was its recent space probe. In this field, the United States is still trying to "catch up" and make up for the head start of the Soviets. Our space accomplishments during the past year justify the belief that we are making good relative progress.

The Chinese Communists seem to be going into a dark night of massed regimentation and forced labor. What they call the great leap forward is in reality a tragic fall backward into the abyss of human slavery.

Asian nations are experiencing one aspect of Communist economic development: The Communist tactic of flooding their market places with goods at less than prevailing prices. This has widespread effects, some of which reach into our own country. As one example only, the dumping of cotton textiles in Southeast Asia has reduced Japanese exports in that area and is already reducing exports of cotton from the United States to Japan. As Communist economic power grows, we must anticipate and plan for further shocks to the free world economic structure from the Communist trade offensive.

Communist economic methods involve costs in human privation and misery that, for us, are not only repugnant but completely unacceptable. We believe that over the long run such a process must inevitably be altered. Already there are indications that the Soviet leaders are beginning to realize this. There is some scaling down of their heavy industry ambitions. They are beginning to heed demands by workers and peasants for more leisure and for a greater share in the fruits of their labor. Peoples sufficiently educated to operate a modern industrial state may be expected also to acquire the desire for freedom and the capacity to get it. History gives us good reason to believe that the Soviet peoples will not indefinitely submit to dictatorial rule by the International Communist Party leadership. It would appear that the Communists will encounter difficulties increasing in the long run.

But for the short run—and this may be a period of years—the situation is full of danger.

That means that we may face a period even harder than we have become used to. To get advantage from time we shall have to stand on our course. We shall need the national will to stand firm in the face of aggressive threats and probings from the Sino-Soviet bloc. We shall need to make whatever unusual sacrifices may be necessary. People respond to this kind of demand when they understand that a temporary emergency requires it. But these burdens seem to grow heavier the longer they must be borne during a period of relative peace. Our people will need to show what freedom can mean in terms of self-sacrifice and self-discipline; and in terms of fortitude and perseverance.

IV. WORLD ORDER

Let me speak now about world order. This requires an elimination of the use or threat of force to accomplish international change. This was always a bad method. It has become an intolerable method because the force at man's disposal could now practically obliterate human life on this planet.

The United States and other free world nations have, by their conduct, done much to establish, for themselves, the principle of the renunciation of aggressive force; and they have shown their ability and will to deter such use of force by others.

At the time of the Suez affair and the Israeli-Egyptian hostilities, the United Kingdom and France, and then Israel, responding to the overwhelming opinion of the United Nations, withdrew their armed

forces and accepted a United Nations solution. This may well prove to be a historical landmark.

During the past year the United States and its partners have further shown their opposition to change through force or the threat of force.

When Lebanon and Jordan seemed threatened from without and appealed to the United States and the United Kingdom for emergency aid, we responded with promptness and efficiency. When the emergency was relieved by United Nations action, we promptly withdrew our forces.

Throughout the world small nations felt a profound sense of reassurance.

In the Far East the Chinese Communists, with Soviet backing, initiated military action designed, as they put it, to expel the United States from the western Pacific. We stood beside the Republic of China as it resisted what seemed the preliminaries of that attack. Our free world associates generally supported our position that change in that area should not be effected by force of arms.

The Government of the Republic of China itself made a notable contribution when, last October, it declared that it relied primarily upon peaceful principles and not upon force to secure the freedom of the mainland. This courageous and statesmanlike act has strengthened the free world's cause in the western Pacific.

Now in Berlin we face an effort to expel the small western contingents in West Berlin. Their presence constitutes an indispensable safeguard to the freedom of that city. The NATO powers, at their December meeting, unanimously vowed that such expulsion should be resisted.

Step by step, discernible progress continues to be made in consolidating a system of collective security which will effectively operate to exclude the use of force to effect international changes.

The mutual security arrangements which we have with free world countries no longer assume the aspect of mere military alliances. They are the framework of consultative processes that, day by day, are steadily reforming the society of free nations.

In primitive and frontier societies, security is on an individual basis. Each householder defends himself by his own means. That primitive formula is now obsolete domestically. It is becoming obsolete internationally. Many free nations combine to help each other. The resultant power is not a power which can be or would be used for any aggressive or nationalistic purpose. It is a power dedicated to the common welfare as mutually agreed.

The United States has repeatedly made clear—and I said this again at the last December NATO meeting—that we regard our own military power as being a trust for the benefit of our free world partnerships; that we are ready to make known to all the defensive purposes and circumstances under which that force might be used; and that we shall heed in this respect, the advice and counsel of our partners just as we would expect them to heed our advice and counsel with respect to the international use of their force.

Thus, out of what may originally have been conceived primarily as military alliances, there is developing an international structure which provides collective security on the basis of organized and continuous collective consultation. That is something new in history.

I might add that accomplishment is not always easy given the variety of national development and national viewpoints. Nevertheless, the free world practice in this regard constantly grows in efficiency.

World order is not, however, assured merely by the elimination of violence. There must be processes of peaceful change. These, too,

are rapidly developing within the free world. The General Assembly of the United Nations is a forum where these needs find effective expression. The General Assembly does not have the power to legislate change. But it has a capacity to induce change, at least in the case of governments which have respect for, and are responsive to, world opinion.

The peace of the free world is not a peace of political stagnation or a peace which sanctifies the status quo. It is a peace characterized by peaceful change reflecting new human aspirations and potentialities.

There is, of course, need not only for processes which permit of peaceful change, but there is equally a need for stability in respecting international agreements and treaties. This requires that, unless international law and treaty engagements are changed by common agreement, they should be respected.

There has not been as great a development of international law and recourse to judicial processes as would be desirable. The United Nations General Assembly Committee on the codification of international law has made little progress. Some significant progress in law development was made at the recent Law of the Sea Conference, and that Conference will be resumed in 1960. Inadequate use has been made of the International Court of Justice. As the President said last week in the state of the Union address, we envisage further steps to encourage the greater use of that Court.

In such ways as I describe progress is being made toward establishing a world order where peace rests, not on mere expediency or on a balance of power, but on a basis of sound institutions.

This evolution is not spectacular and rarely considered news. What attracts attention are the aggressive probings of the Communists, and the free world reactions thereto. That gives the impression that our foreign policy consists primarily of reacting to Communist initiatives.

Nothing could be further from the truth. The fact is that day by day, month by month, and year by year, we are building, quietly but steadily, in the United Nations, in NATO, in the OAS, in SEATO, and other organs of consultation, the solid foundations of an international order based upon justice and law as substitutes for force.

The Communist rulers do not share in this effort to build a stable world order based upon justice and law. International communism avowedly seeks worldwide dictatorship. The concept of justice is alien to the Communist creed, and law, in our sense of that word, is unknown. The free world and Communist concepts are mutually antagonistic.

This, however, does not mean that there cannot be useful contacts and negotiations with the Communists. We have had many such. We are striving to make progress in the field of disarmament and in that connection deal with the Soviets, particularly in relation to the controlled discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests. We also seek agreement on possible measures which might be helpful in preventing surprise attack.

At Warsaw we negotiate with the Chinese Communists.

We have made clear our willingness to negotiate about the German question.

We have now an agreement with the Soviet Union on cultural and scientific exchanges which is operating satisfactorily. Also important are the visits to and from Russia of influential citizens.

President Eisenhower urged this in his letter of February 16, 1958, to the then Soviet Premier. Following this initiative, there have been useful visits on both sides, and we are glad that the First Deputy Premier of the Soviet Union, Mr. Mikoyan, is now here learning about our country. We would

like to see a broader exchange of students. We believe that in such ways false premises and miscalculations can be reduced in the interest of peace.

V. THE INEVITABLE MOVEMENT TOWARD FREEDOM

I turn now to our second major purpose. One of the strongest forces working in the world today is the movement toward independence and freedom.

This force is notably manifest in Africa. Here change is rapid, new states are arising almost overnight. This great continent presents a challenge to the United States to do its best to assist the peoples now emerging into independence and new opportunity.

Another such area is our hemisphere to the south. The peoples of Latin America are making clear their determination to control their own destinies. One by one dictatorships have made way for governments more responsive to the popular will.

"This worldwide movement toward freedom is accompanied by a growing awareness of the deadly nature of Sino-Soviet imperialism." The leaders of the new freedom are coming more and more to see international communism as an immediate threat to their liberties, not, as some have thought, a mere bogeyman of so-called Western imperialism.

The Communists are paying a price for the forced growth of their material power: There is a developing fear in the less powerful nations around the world of the dangerous combination of burgeoning economic and military power with the imperialist drive of the Communists for world dominion. This menacing combination brings home with force the threat which, when the Communists were not so strong, was but a matter of vague and largely academic concern.

There has recently been a surprising clarification of understanding around the world of the real purpose of Communist leaders—to subject all the world to the dominant influence and control of international communism, with its primary power centers at Moscow and Peking.

In the Middle East the deadly designs of communism are now far more clearly realized than a year ago.

In southeast Asia liberty-loving peoples are struggling—and with success—to remain masters in their newly built national homes.

In general, I believe the leaders and peoples of Asia now understand better the sincerity of American policy favoring their independence and our willingness to support unconditionally their efforts to stay free and do so in their own way, which may indeed be a non-Western way.

In France, we are witnessing an inspiring example of national renewal.

The tide of freedom is running strong in Western Europe as Communist strength there ebbs.

Even in Communist countries there is a powerful and persistent craving for greater national freedom. Yugoslavia has been steadfast against all threats and blandishments from Moscow and has courageously maintained its independence. Hungary's great effort to throw off its shackles, even though crushed by force, has been an inspiration and a tribute to man's unquenchable thirst for liberty. And throughout the bloc, even in the U.S.S.R., revisionism is a living force and ferment. Moscow considers it a deadly enemy, and with reason.

The pull of freedom is daily manifested in the flow of refugees from the Communist bloc to the free world.

The free people of West Berlin have, during years of uncertainty and danger, been an inspiring beacon light for all those whose liberties have been lost to Communist tyranny. We are determined that this light

shall not fail, and that Berlin shall not be engulfed in the Red undertow.

As we look ahead, we see freedom as a predominant force, shaping our 20th-century world. As Americans, we have faith that the aspiration, deep within the soul of man, to live freely and with dignity in a just and peaceful world is stronger than all the material forces which the Communists invoke as the pledge and promise of their power.

VI. ECONOMIC PROGRESS

I turn now to our third basic purpose.

We believe that economic progress is a necessary condition of stable and free nations. There must also be acceptance of economic interdependence of nations. No nation can live completely to itself.

Unless and until the less developed areas reach the stage of self-sustaining economic growth, the world as a whole will suffer. For the inhabitants of those areas, an increasing rate of economic development has become an essential condition of free societies. The demand for economic and social betterment is now universal, and if progress cannot be achieved in freedom, it will be sought by methods that jeopardize freedom.

The Communists are fully aware of the universal demand for progress, and they point to the Soviet and Chinese Communist accomplishments in industrialization as proof that their way is better than the way of freedom.

Our aid and investment must continue to support the efforts of the leaders of the developing free nations to sustain their peoples' confidence that economic progress can be attained in freedom.

We have not been alone in providing such support. Other highly industrialized states have made significant contributions.

These industrialized nations have also shown a growing awareness of interdependence among themselves. This is particularly gratifying to us. A common market for Europe was one of the policy objectives stated in the preamble to the European Recovery Act of 1948. Now, after 10 years, the six-nation European Common Market is a fact. The Western European currencies have become more freely exchangeable and there is a strong movement for broader economic cooperation in Western Europe.

Free world economic progress does not permit complacency or relaxation. It calls instead for renewed effort to increase the forward momentum.

In the years ahead, we must through our trade and financial policies continue to promote recognition and positive use of the benefits of interdependence. These benefits, and the inevitability, of economic interdependence become more clear each year. What is being done in the European Community of Six provides an example and an inspiration for greater economic cooperation elsewhere in the world.

We must continue to apply our will, energy, treasure, and techniques to the problems of the less developed areas. The cause of freedom can be won—or could be lost—in these areas.

VII. CONCLUSION

Let me in conclusion recall the basic purposes underlying our policies:

(1) The renunciation of aggressive force and the substitutions of collective institutions of peace, justice, and law among nations;

(2) Promotion of the concept of human dignity, worth, and freedom;

(3) Stimulation of economic growth and interdependence to create enlarged opportunities for realization of cultural and spiritual values.

These goals are not attainable in a few years, but will require decades and, perhaps even generations. Why is this so? We are but one nation among nearly a hundred

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

January 17

sovereignties, and but a scant 6 percent of the world's land surface and population. Our foreign policy is not something we can enact into world law or dictate to other peoples. It means rather constant adjustment to forces which, though beyond our control to direct, we can influence through wise statesmanship and adherence to sound principles. With our immense wealth and power, and even more because of our spiritual heritage of faith and freedom, we can exert a shaping influence on the world of the future.

The price of failure would be the destruction of all our other national objectives. While mustering all our resources, both material and spiritual, we must press on with courage to build surer foundations for the interdependent world community of which we are part. This will call for austerity and sacrifice on the part of all. We must put first things first.

Our purpose, ultimately and at all times, should be to use our great power, without abusing or presuming upon it, to move steadily toward lasting peace, orderly freedom, and growing opportunity. Thus do we achieve our constitutional purpose "to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Senators will find in this statement no forecast of tactics and pressures from the Soviet bloc which may be encountered in 1959, which Secretary Dulles was asked for. Senators will find only one sentence concerning relations with uncommitted African nations, another subject on which the Secretary was asked to speak. There is no discussion in any detail of current issues which may be straining U.S. alliances. There is only the vaguest discussion of any possible changes in U.S. policies in 1959.

With some executive branch witnesses it is possible to pry out information and intelligent discussion of issues with the help of strenuous cross-examination. This takes a great deal of time, and it is wasteful of the energies of both the committee and the witness. I think that the executive branch should know, however, that members of the committee are willing to do this if we must, and do so in public session.

Members of the Committee on Foreign Relations read the newspapers. We read the statements of the President and the Secretary of State. We know generally what is going on in the world. What we need are those additional facts and considerations which make the difference between the casual reader of the newspaper and the well-informed Member of Congress who is trying to discharge his responsibility to understand the actions taken and the proposals made by the executive branch. We need, above all, to hear analytical discussions of the advantages and disadvantages of taking this or that possible course of action with respect to current problems. We also need to know the speculations of the Secretary of State, and other Cabinet members having responsibilities bearing on foreign relations, about the future.

Mr. President, I have made this statement in the hope that succeeding executive branch witnesses in briefings before the Committee on Foreign Relations may pay some attention to our disappointment over past performance.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have been listening very patiently to the statements of Senators during the morning hour. I think such statements should be limited to the 3 minutes prescribed in the unanimous-consent agreement. I hope that the present occupant of the chair or any other occupant of the chair will limit the statements of Senators to 3 minutes during the morning hour. Some Senators have exceeded limitation. A Senator could occupy the entire morning hour by using 3 minutes on each of a series of subjects. Many other Senators still desire to place matters in the RECORD. I myself desire to speak for about 5 minutes. I shall courteously wait until the other Senators have placed their matters in the RECORD. But I think the Chair should limit Senators to the 3 minutes provided for in the unanimous-consent agreement.

REOPENING OF CONSULATE AT BRAZZAVILLE, FRENCH EQUATORIAL AFRICA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to express my great pleasure in hearing that the United States on January 1 reopened its consulate at Brazzaville, French Equatorial Africa. The consulate has the four newly autonomous republics of French Equatorial Africa within its consular jurisdiction, an area of almost 1 million square miles running from the Sahara Desert to the rain forest of the Congo.

Because of budgetary limitations, as of last year, not even a single American representative was stationed in a region one-third the size of the United States. I am sorry to say that even the names of these political entities, which recently have chosen to remain linked with France, are relatively unfamiliar in this country. Yet these, and almost all other African areas, are astir with new desires and movements for political and economic development.

The free world countries, and especially the United States, must watch trends in Africa with close and sympathetic attention. We urgently need more observers in the area. This is why I am so pleased to learn that we have opened a new post headed by a career Foreign Service officer who already has experience in the region.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the State Department press release concerning the reopening of this consulate.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 8, 1959.

UNITED STATES REOPENS AMERICAN CONSULATE AT BRAZZAVILLE, FRENCH EQUATORIAL AFRICA

The United States reopened its consulate at Brazzaville, French Equatorial Africa, on January 1, 1959. The consulate has all of French Equatorial Africa, including the autonomous Republics of Gabon, Middle Congo, Ubangi-Shari, and Chad, within its consular jurisdiction.

Francis N. Magllozzi, of Massachusetts, career Foreign Service officer, is the consul in charge. Mr. Magllozzi joined the Foreign Service in 1947. He has served at the American consulate general in Frankfort as well as American Embassies in Copenhagen, Baghdad, and Brussels in that order. His last post was the American consulate general in Leopoldville, where he actually was assigned as resident consul in Brazzaville prior to the formal reopening of the post.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF BOUNDARY WATERS TREATY OF 1909 BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND CANADA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to an important occasion that has received little notice, namely, the 50th anniversary last Saturday of the signing of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 between the United States and Canada. The International Joint Commission set up under this treaty has played a vital role in enabling our nations to undertake such a great and mutually beneficial project as the St. Lawrence seaway.

It has been most appropriate that we should have had an eminent group of Canadian parliamentarians visiting us over the last weekend, and that important economic talks between Canada and the United States have just concluded after reaffirming our myriad common interests. These are additional examples of the friendly abiding ties between our two great countries. I hope we will do everything we can to nourish our already fertile relationship by giving it the closest possible attention.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a public statement by Secretary of State Dulles about this occasion be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 10, 1959.

STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE ON THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF THE BOUNDARY WATERS TREATY OF 1909

Today, January 11, 1959, is the 50th anniversary of the signing of the treaty which established the International Joint Commission of the United States and Canada and provided that " * * * the navigation of all navigable boundary waters shall forever continue free."

This treaty and the Commission which it established have made an important contribution to the maintenance of the excellent relations which we have enjoyed with Canada over the years. It has provided a means of resolving problems connected with boundary waters through mutual cooperation, and it exemplifies the spirit with which we and our Canadian neighbors have approached many other questions of joint concern.

The problems which have come before the International Joint Commission since 1909 have touched the lives and interests of countless citizens on both sides of the border. They have ranged from consideration of relatively minor matters such as the proposal of an individual to block a trans-boundary stream to decisions controlling vast power and navigation projects of the St. Lawrence River, but all have received fair and thorough consideration by the Commission with a view to protecting the rights of all concerned.